Qualitative Criterion for Interception in a Pursuit/Evasion Game

J. A. MORGAN

The Aerospace Corporation, P. O. Box 92957

Los Angeles, CA 90009,

United States of America

arXiv:0901.1416v4 [math.OC] 25 Sep 2009

Abstract

A qualitative account is given of a differential pursuit/evasion game. A criterion for the existence of an intercept solution is obtained using future cones that contain all attainable trajectories of target or interceptor originating from an initial position. A necessary and sufficient conditon that an opportunity to intercept always exist is that, after some initial time, the future cone of the target be contained within the future cone of the interceptor. The sufficient condition may be regarded as a kind of Nash equillibrium.

I. INTRODUCTION

In this note we consider the differential game that describes the pursuit of a target with position $y(t)$ at time t, by an interceptor whose position at time t is $x(t)$. Both target and interceptor are assumed to maneuver freely and autonomously, subject to certain overall constraints. The evolution of x and y is given by

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = f(x, u) \tag{1}$$

and

$$\frac{dy}{dt} = g(y, v). \tag{2}$$

Here f and g are assumed to be bounded analytic functions, and $u = u(t)$ and $v = v(t)$ are piecewise analytic controls. The histories of x, y, and v are assumed to be known up to time t. If a control u can be found such that at a time t_i the interceptor has contrived to maneuver so that $\| x - y \| = 0$, an interception is deemed to have taken place, and the game terminates. This problem is a simplified version of one posed by Pontryagin [6].

This study addresses the conditions under which an interception can take place, rather than with conditions of optimality as to time to interception, or payoff functionals. We seek conditions under which an interception is *guaranteed* to be possible. There is no assumption, for example, that an interception, if possible, will actually take place. We are more concerned with the existence of a solution to the game than with payoffs. However, in the present context we may assume that only terminal payoffs are of interest, and that these need not sum to zero. In the terminology of Isaacs [1], we regard this problem as a game of kind.

The principal tool used to study this problem is the relation between future cones, as defined in Section (II), of target and interceptor. Constraints on the motion of either player enter the problem formulation through the topology of the future cones.

One may consider the results proved below as a mathematical exercise confirming the commonplace observation in naval warfare that, in order to defeat an adversary in a surface engagement, it is sufficient and necessary to turn inside the adverary's turning radius. Although the discussion will be couched in terms of trajectories in $\mathbf{R}^3$, appropriate for aircraft, missiles, spacecraft, or simple predator/prey interactions, the results clearly hold in $\mathbf{R}^2$, as, for example, in the case of surface naval vessels, or in dimensions higher than three. The extension to more than two players is discussed in the sequel.

II. THE FUTURE CONE

We begin by defining the future cone of a maneuvering player, and sketching some of its properties. Under the influence of propulsive forces, of its control $u(t)$, and of external forces such as gravity or aerodynamic drag, the position $x(t)$ of the interceptor will evolve as it maneuvers. The evolution as given by (1) will be continuous, but need not always be differentiable, depending on the nature of f and of the control $u(t)$. Identical remarks hold for $y(t)$. For an effective interceptor, the control for x will depend upon the history of y, in general, and the motion of both interceptor and target may be quite involved. One may think of their trajectories as being representatives of generic Feynman paths in $\mathbf{R}^3$. But, as a practical matter, both target and interceptor will respect certain physical limitations as to, say, maximum acceleration or total velocity change Δv. In addition, the interaction between target and interceptor may be expected to take place during a finite engagement time interval, and to be confined within a finite engagement volume.

At some initial time t_0 the interceptor will occupy a definite position $x(t_0)$. If we consider all possible histories for $x(t)$ originating at $x(t_0)$, these will comprise a topological cone in $\mathbf{R}^4$ with vertex $x(t_0)$. We call this set the future cone of $x(t_0)$ and denote the set of points subsequently accessible to the interceptor in the time interval (t_1, t_2), with $t_0 \leq t_1 < t_2$, by$K_x^+(t_1 : t_2; x(t_0))$. Clearly, the future cone originating from a vertex at time $t_1 \subset$ the cone originating from any vertex at a time $t_0 < t_1$.

We may suppose that a freely maneuvering player is able to move in any direction in $\mathbf{R}^3$ and that, if it can maneuver to a point $x(t)$, it can likewise maneuver to points within any small neighborhood of $x(t)$. It will thus be convenient to regard the sets $K_x^+(t_1 : t_2; x(t_0))$ and $K_y^+(t_1 : t_2; y(t_0))$ as open for $t_0 < t_1 < t_2$. (The extension to closed future cones will be discussed in Section (IV)).The assumption that both target and interceptor can maneuver freely permits us to treat the future cone for each as a path-connected manifold for $t > t_0$; in particular, as path-connected for each value of t. The attainable trajectories intersecting each point in a spacelike section $K_x^+(t)$ of a future cone, *i.e.* the subset of the cone at any single value of $t \in (t_1, t_2)$, are nowhere tangent to the section, by virtue of the boundedness of F. For $t_1 \neq t_2, K_x^+(t_1) \cap K_x^+(t_2) = \emptyset$. We conclude that the future cones of target and interceptor for $t > t_0$ both admit a timelike foliation [5], and that their spacelike sections are leaves of the foliation. Every attainable trajectory thus traverses leaves

of the future cone in a positive sense as time increases. Given leaf $K_x^+(t_0)$, a leaf $K_x^+(t_1)$ with $t_1 > t_0$ is generated by exponentiating the action of the tangent space over each point $x(t_0) \in K_x^+(t_0)$ corresponding to admissible values of $\Delta\mathbf{v}$. The ability of either target or interceptor to maneuver freely also implies that the tangent space over any point in $K^+(t_0)$ is balanced[13], and thus any leaf to its future will be the union of convex neighborhoods. As bounded subsets of $\mathbf{R}^4$, the sets $K_x^+(t_1 : t_2; x(t_0))$ and $K_y^+(t_1 : t_2; y(t_0))$ have compact closure. Let $K_y^+(t_1 : t_2; y(t_0)) \subseteq K_x^+(t_1 : t_2; x(t_0))$ and consider an open covering of $K_y^+(t_1 : t_2; y(t_0))$ that includes $K_x^+(t_1 : t_2; x(t_0))$. Compactness of $\overline{K_x^+}(t_1 : t_2; x(t_0))$ thus implies that $K_y^+(t_1 : t_2; y(t_0))$ is covered by a finite union of convex neighborhoods.

The foregoing remarks serve to justify the assumptions we shall make regarding the future cones of target and interceptor. It will be assumed that the subset of either cone lying to the future of its vertex is a manifold possessing a timelike foliation, whose leaves are locally convex, and which posesses a finite convex cover. In particular, there is no assumption that the future cone of either target or interceptor, or their leaves, are necessarily convex as a whole.

III. CONDITIONS FOR INTERCEPTION

A. Guaranteed Interception

The existence and character of optimal solutions to equations (1) and (2) leading to interception has been well-studied since the work recounted in Pontryagin [6]; *vide.* [7, 8, 9]. Our concern here is with a qualitative description of conditions under which we may be confident that the interceptor can force an interception, optimally or no. A winning pure strategy of the interceptor is to choose an attainable trajectory that will lead to interception of the target. (A mixed strategy would choose among multiple trajectories with this property.) This choice amounts to a mapping $F : K_x^+ \to K_x^+$ from the set of all trajectories available to the interceptor to its desired *actual* trajectory. For present purposes, a *guaranteed intercept* will be said to exist when an interception solution always exists, no matter how the target maneuvers within its future cone. For the remainder of this note, by "intercept" is to be understood "guaranteed intercept" even when not explicitly so identified.

B. Interception at a Specified Time: A Condition on Leaves

We begin by proving a

Lemma: A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a guaranteed intercept is that, at the time of intercept t_i,

$$K_y^+(t_i; y(t_1)) \subseteq K_x^+(t_i; x(t_0)). \tag{3}$$

for $t_0, t_1 < t_i$.

Proof: The necessary condition is elementary. Suppose a guaranteed intercept exists at time t_i. Then, every point y in $K_y^+(t_i; y(t_1))$ must coincide with some point x in $K_x^+(t_i; x(t_0))$ in order that $\| x-y \| = 0$ for at least one pair of values of x and y. Were (3) false, there would be some portion of $K_y^+(t_i)$ that lay outside the attainable set of interceptor positions at that time. Thus there would be a subset of $K_y^+(t_i; y(t_1))$ for which $\| x-y \| > 0, \forall x \in K_x^+(t_i; x(t_0))$.

The sufficient condition relies upon a fixed-point theorem for multifunctions due to Tian [11]. Assume that (3) holds. Then $K_x^+(t_i; x(t_0))$ is a nonempty compact subset of the separated convex space $\mathbf{R}^3$, and its intersection with $K_y^+(t_i; y(t_1))$ is nonempty. Suppose that, of all the possible trajectories $\subset K_y^+(t_i; y(t_1))$, the actual trajectory of the target is $y^*(t)$. The mapping from $K_x^+(t_i; x(t_0))$ into $K_y^+(t_i; y(t_1)) \cap K_x^+(t_i; x(t_0)) = K_y^+(t_i; y(t_1))$ given by $F(x) = \{y^*(t_i)\}$ is closed and convex, $\forall x \in K_x^+(t_i; x(t_0))$. For a sequence x_n tending to any $x(t_i) \in K_x^+(t_i; x(t_0))$, $F(x_n) = \{y^*(t_i)\} = F(x(t_i))$. The mapping F is thus upper semicontinuous. The point $y^*(t_i) \in N_{y^*(t_i)}$ of $K_x^+(t_i; x(t_0))$, where $N_{y^*(t_i)}$ is one of the convex sets that comprise the finite open cover of $K_y^+(t_1 : t_2; y(t_0))$. Therefore, $F(x)) \cap N_{y^*(t_i)} \neq \emptyset, \forall x \in N_{y^*(t_i)}$. The requirements of Theorem 3 of Tian [11] are thus satisfied. Combining the consequent fixed point $x^*(t_i)$ for F with the tautological fixed point $y^*(t_i) \in K_y^+(t_i; y(t_1))$ resulting from the target's ability to maneuver freely, we may write

$$\begin{pmatrix} x^*(t_i) \\ y^*(t_i) \end{pmatrix} \in \begin{pmatrix} \{y^*(t_i)\} \\ K_y^+(t_i; y(t_1)) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

□

C. General Interception Condition

We next extend the Lemma to the corresponding assertion for the entire cone $K_y^+(t_0 : t_1; y(t_1))$. The conditions for existence of a guaranteed intercept are given by the

Theorem: Let $t_\alpha < t_0 < t_1 < t_\omega$. Then, a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a guaranteed intercept at $t_i \in [t_0, t_1]$ is that

$$K_y^+(t_0 : t_1; y(t_0)) \subset K_x^+(t_\alpha : t_\omega; x(t_\alpha)) \tag{5}$$

Proof: The sufficient condition follows the reasoning used in the Lemma, applied to the sets K_y^+ and K_x^+ in the locally convex separated topological vector space $\mathbf{R}^4$. The mapping now is into the target trajectory $F(x) = \{y^*(t), t \in [t_0, t_1]\}$, which (as before) is closed, convex, and upper semicontinuous. To show existence, choose a time $t \in [t_0, t_1]$. By previous remarks, a convex neighborhood $N^j_{y^*(t)}$ belonging to a finite open cover of $K_y^+(t_1 : t_2; y(t_0))$ exists for which $F(x)) \cap \overline{N}^j_{y^*(t)} = \{y^*(t), t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]\} \neq \emptyset$ for some $t_j, t_{j+1} \in [t_0, t_1]\}$ and $\forall x \in N^j_{y^*(t)}$. Then, Theorem 3 of Tian [11] gives existence of a fixed point for $t_0 < t_i < t_1$ such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} x^*(t_i) \\ y^*(t_i) \end{pmatrix} \in \begin{pmatrix} \{y^*(t), \forall t \in [t_0, t_1]\} \\ K_y^+(t_0 : t_1; y(t_0)) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

The necessary condition is obtained by transfinite induction [3]. Let $t_\alpha < t_0 < t_\beta < t_\gamma < t_i < t_1 < t_\omega$ and take $t_i - t$ as an ordinal. We prove the result for $K_y^+(t_\beta : t_1; y(t_0)) \subset K_y^+(t_0 : t_1; y(t_0))$ and extend to the full set $K_y^+(t_0 : t_1; y(t_0))$ at the end.

We begin by showing the necessary condition holds at late times. Suppose that a guaranteed intercept exists at time t_i for t_γ, t_i within any neighborhood of t_1. As $t_\gamma \to t_1$,

$$K_y^+(t_\gamma : t_1; y(t_0)) \to K_y^+(t_1; y(t_0)). \tag{7}$$

By Lemma 1, it follows that

$$K_y^+(t_1; y(t_0)) \subseteq K_x^+(t_1; x(t_\gamma)) \subset K_x^+(t_\alpha : t_\omega; x(t_\alpha)) \tag{8}$$

Next, suppose that at least one guaranteed intercept opportunity exists for time t_i between t_γ and t_1. By the inductive hypothesis,

$$K_y^+(t_\gamma : t_1; y(t_0)) \subset K_x^+(t_\alpha : t_\omega; x(t_\alpha)) \tag{9}$$

We wish to examine the prospects at an earlier time t_β. Consider the sets $K_y^+(t_\beta : t_\gamma; y(t_0))$ and $K_x^+(t_\beta : t_\gamma; x(t_\alpha))$:

$$K_y^+(t_\beta : t_1; y(t_0)) = K_y^+(t_\beta : t_\gamma; y(t_0)) \cup K_y^+(t_\gamma : t_1; y(t_0)) \tag{10}$$

and similarly for K_x^+. If a guaranteed intercept is to be possible $\forall t \in (t_\beta, t_\gamma)$, at no time t in (t_β, t_γ) can it be that

$$K_y^+(t; y(t_0)) \not\subseteq K_x^+(t; x(t_\alpha)), \tag{11}$$

by Lemma 1. Letting $t_\beta \to t_0$, we have (5). □

IV. DISCUSSION

The sufficient conditions (4) and (6) have been posed in the form of a Nash equillibrium [4]. The payoff for the interceptor is positive, while that for the target is negative. One may paraphrase the outcome as follows: The target can navigate to any point in its future cone but, no matter how the target moves, so long as the future cone of the target lies within that for the interceptor, the interceptor can always maneuver to the target's position.

Were $K_x^+(t_\alpha : t_\omega; x(t_\alpha))$ a convex set, the sufficient condition for the Theorem would follow immediately from the Kakutani [2] fixed point theorem applied to $\overline{K_x^+}$. This assumption is stronger than might be desired, but we may suppose the interceptor can choose to maneuver within a convex future cone during an engagement, if that is to its advantage. This observation amounts to regarding the choice of future cone as part of specifying a strategy for the interceptor.

One may treat future cones that are closed sets by taking the closure of the sets used in Section (III C)[14]. Provided that the boundaries of $\overline{K_{x,y}^+}$ consist of trajectories with the properities described in Section (II), they satisfy a transversality condition with respect to the leaves of the cones. The closed cones thus admit a timelike foliation. Then, if

$$\overline{K_y^+} \subset \overline{K_x^+}, \tag{12}$$

both necessary and sufficient conditions for the Theorem are satisfied.

Extension of these results to dimensionalities other than three poses no difficulties. As in Nash [4], the extension to an n-player game is likewise straightforward. However, the interpretation of the results differs for the notable case of a single interceptor maneuvering

to intercept one genuine target amidst a number of indistinguishable decoys. Recall that the game terminates when an interception occurs; that is, we do not assume that an interceptor can engage multiple targets in succession. In this case, a guaranteed intercept will certainly exist, but it might lead to the interception of a worthless decoy. Only if the number of interceptors equals or exceeds the number of targets real and bogus, can one say with confidence that the conditions on the future cones of targets and interceptors obtained in this note guarantee the existence of interception opportunities for all actual targets.

---

[1] Isaacs, R. 1965 *Differential Games*, John Wiley and Sons

[2] Kakutani, S. 1941 A Generalization of Brouwer's Fixed Point Theorem, *Duke Math J. 8*, 457-459

[3] Kelley, J. L. 1955 *General Topology*, pp. 270-271, Van Nostrand

[4] Nash, J. F. 1950 Equillibrium Points in N-Person Games, *Proc. N. A. S.* 36, 48-49

[5] Novikov, S. P. 1967 Topology of foliations, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 14*, 268-304

[6] Pontryagin, L. S. 1964 On Some Differential Games, *J. SIAM Controls* 3, 49-52

[7] Pontryagin, L. S. 1971 Lectures on Differential Games, Stanford University, CA (reprinted as DTIC AD724166)

[8] Pontryagin, L. S. 1974 On the Evasion Process in Differential Games, *Appl. Math and Optimization 1*, 5-19

[9] Pontryagin, L. S. 1981 Linear Differential Games of Pursuit, *Math. USSR Sbornik 40*, 285-303

[10] Roxin, E. 1969 Axiomatic Approach in Differential Games, *J. Opt. Theory and App. 3*, 153-163

[11] Tian, C. G. 1991 Fixed Point Theorems for Mappings with Non-compact and Non-convex Domains, *J. Math. Analysis and Applications* 158, 161-167

[12] Varaiya, P. 1967 On the Existence of Solutions to a Differential Game, *J. SIAM Controls 5*, 5-19

[13] The tangent space T over a point is balanced if $x \in T$ implies $t\,x \in T$, where $|t| \leq 1$

[14] A closed future cone is equivalent to the *attainable set* introduced by Varaiya [12] and Roxin [10] in a different context.